

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed March 22, 2004. Claims 1 – 38 were pending in the present application. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 18. Claims 1 – 38 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(b) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 9-11, 18-23 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Christensen et al. (U.S. Patent 4,271,468) (hereinafter “Christensen”). As set forth in more detail below, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

While Applicant maintains that the distinctions previously asserted in regard to claims 1 and 18 are still valid, to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant has also made a similar amendment to claim 18.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 2-8, 12-17, 24 and 29-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christensen. Applicant asserts that pending claims 2 – 8 and 24 are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons given above in regard to their respective independent claims.

In regard to independent claims 12, 29, 30 and 31, the Examiner cites *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., Inc.* for the premise that it is generally considered to be within the ordinary skill of the art to duplicate parts for a multiplied effect. However, duplicating queues Q0-Q7 in Christensen would simply provide more queues at the same level as queues Q0-Q7. Duplicating queues Q0-Q7 in Christensen would not create intermediate levels of the hierarchical channel map nor an organization of channel

sections. Furthermore, the one or more intermediate levels recited in claims 12, 29 and 30 are not “duplicate parts for a multiplied effect” of either the top level or lowest level of the hierarchical channel map. The one or more intermediate levels are recited as having functionality distinct from either the top-level or lowest level. Therefore, the Examiner’s reliance on *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., Inc.* is clearly misplaced.

Applicant also respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion that “the stages of Christensen provide for an organized system, and accordingly, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include additional organizational stages within the hierarchy of Christensen in order to provide additional organization for a multiplied effect.” Christensen teaches eight queues, each of which may contain a number of active entries representing pending interrupt requests. (col. 6, lines 3 – 14) Christensen further teaches that a pending register has eight bit positions which correspond to the eight queues. The set state of a pending register bit indicates that its queue is non-empty, while a reset state indicates its corresponding bit is empty. (Col. 6, lines 24 – 50) Christensen does not teach “organizational stages,” as the Examiner suggests. To the extent that the PND register or queues in Christensen could be considered “organizational stages”, any duplication of this parts would only have an effect at the same level. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to have introduced intermediate stages between Christensen’s queues and pending register.

Applicants also assert that all the distinctions over Christensen noted in the previous remain valid.

In regard to both the section 102 and section 103 rejections, Applicant also asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recited further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-36000/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☐ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Fee Authorization Form authorizing a deposit account debit in the amount of \$
for fees ().
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: June 1, 2004